Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Bounding the Size of a Network Defined By Visibility Property

Andreas D. M. Gunawan · Louxin Zhang

arXiv:1510.00115v1 [q-bio.PE] 1 Oct 2015

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Phylogenetic networks are mathematical structures for modeling and visualization of reticulation processes in the study of evolution. Galled networks, reticulation visible networks, nearly-stable networks and stable-child networks are the four classes of phylogenetic networks that are recently introduced to study the topological and algorithmic aspects of phylogenetic networks. We prove the following results.

(1) A binary galled network with n leaves has at most $2(n-1)$ reticulation nodes.
(2) A binary nearly-stable network with n leaves has at most $3(n-1)$ reticulation nodes.
(3) A binary stable-child network with n leaves has at most $7(n-1)$ reticulation nodes.

Keywords phylogenetic network · galled network · reticulation visibility · nearly-stable property · stable-child property

1 Introduction

Reticulation processes refer to the transfer of genetic material between living organisms in a non-reproduction manner. Horizontal gene transfer is believed to be a highly significant reticulation process occurring between single-cell organisms (Doolittle and Bapteste 2007; Treangen and Rocha 2011). Other reticulation processes include introgression, recombination and hybridization (Fontaine et al. 2015; McBreen and Lockhart 2006; Marcussen et al. 2014). In the past two decades, phylogenetic networks have often been seen for the

Andreas Dwi Maryanto Gunawan · Louxin Zhang
Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, Block S17, Lower Kent Ridge Road 10, Singapore 119076.
E-mail: a0054645@u.nus.edu

modeling and visualization of reticulation processes (Gusfield 2014; Huson et al. 2011).

Galled trees, galled networks, reticulation visible networks are three of the popular classes of phylogenetic networks introduced to study the combinatorial and algorithmic perspectives of phylogenetics (Wang et al. 2001; Gusfield et al. 2004; Huson and Kloepper 2007; Huson et al. 2011). Reticulation visible networks include galled trees and galled networks. They are tree-based (Gambette et al. 2015). The tree-based networks are introduced by Francis and Steel (2015) recently.

It is well known that the number of internal nodes in a phylogenetic tree with n leaves is $n-1$. In contrast, an arbitrary phylogenetic network with 2 leaves can have as many internal nodes as possible. Therefore, one interesting research problem is how large a phylogenetic network in a particular class can be. For example, it is well known that a tree-child network with n leaves has $3(n-1)$ non-leaf nodes at most. A regular network with n leaves has 2^n nodes at most (Willson 2010). To investigate whether or not the tree containment problem is polynomial time solvable, surprisingly, Gambette et al. (2015) proved that a reticulation visible network with n leaves has at most $9(n-1)$ non-leaf nodes. The class of nearly-stable networks was also introduced in their paper. They also proved the existence of a linear upper bound on the number of reticulation nodes in a nearly-stable network.

In the present paper, we establish the tight upper bound for the size of a network defined by a visibility property using a sub-tree technique that was introduced in Gambette et al. (2015). The rest of this paper is divided into six sections. Section 2 introduces concepts and notation that are necessary for our study. Recently, Bordewich and Semple (2015) proved that there are at most $3(n-1)$ reticulation nodes in a reticulation visible network. In Section 3, we present a different proof of the $3(n-1)$ tight bound for reticulation visible networks. Section 4 proves that there are at most $2(n-1)$ reticulation nodes in a galled networks with n leaves. Section 5 and 6 establish the tight upper bounds for the sizes of nearly-stable and stable-child networks, respectively. In Section 7, we conclude the work with a few remarks.

2 Basic concept

2.1 Phylogenetic Networks

An acyclic digraph is a simple connected digraph with no directed cycles.

Let $D = (\mathcal{V}(D), \mathcal{E}(D))$ be an acyclic digraph and let u and v be two nodes in D. If $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}(D)$, it is called an *outgoing* edge of u and *incoming edge* of v; u and v are said to be the tail and head of the edge. The numbers of incoming and outgoing edges of a node are called its *indegree* and *outdegree*, respectively. D is said to be *rooted* if there is a unique node $\rho(D)$ with indegree 0; $\rho(D)$ is called the *root* of D. Note that in a rooted acyclic digraph there exists a directed path from the root to every other node.

For $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(D)$, $D - E$ denotes the digraph with the same node set and the edge set $\mathcal{E}(D) - E$. For $V \subseteq \mathcal{V}(D)$, $D - V$ denotes the digraph with the node set $\mathcal{V}(D) - V$ and the edge set $\{(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}(D) | u \notin V \text{ and } v \notin V\}$. If D' and D'' are subdigraphs of D, $D' + D''$ denotes the subdigraph with the node set $\mathcal{V}(D') \cup \mathcal{V}(D'')$ and the edge set $\mathcal{E}(D') \cup \mathcal{E}(D'')$.

A *phylogenetic network* on a finite set of taxa, X, is a rooted acyclic digraph in which each non-root node has either indegree 1 or outdegree 1 and there are exactly $|X|$ nodes of outdegree 0 and indegree 1, called *leaves*, that correspond one-to-one with the taxa in the network.

In a phylogenetic network, a node is called a *tree node* if it is either the root or a node having indegree one; it is called a *reticulation node* if its indegree is greater than one. Note that leaves are tree nodes and a tree node may have both indegree and outdegree one. A non-leaf node is said to be *internal*. A phylogenetic network without reticulation nodes is simply a *phylogenetic tree*.

For a phylogenetic network N, we use the following notation:

- $\rho(N)$: the root of N.
- $\mathcal{V}(N)$: the set of nodes.
- $\mathcal{T}(N)$: the set of tree nodes.
- $\mathcal{R}(N)$: the set of reticulation nodes.
- $\mathcal{E}(N)$: the set of edges.
- $\mathcal{L}(N)$: the set of leaves.

For two nodes u, v in $\mathcal{V}(N)$, if $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}(N)$, u is said to be a *parent* of v and, equivalently, v is a *child* of u. In general, if there is a directed path from u to v, u is an *ancestor* of v and v is a *descendant* of u. We sometimes say that v is below u when u is an ancestor of v.

Let P and Q be two simple paths from u to v in N. We use $\mathcal{V}(P)$ and $\mathcal{V}(Q)$ to denote their node sets, respectively. They are *internally disjoint* if $\mathcal{V}(P) \cap V(Q) = \{u, v\}$.

Finally, a phylogenetic network is *binary*, if its root has outdegree 2 and indegree 0, all internal nodes have degree 3, and all the leaves have indegree one. Here, we are interested in how large a binary phylogenetic network can be.

In the rest of the paper, a binary phylogenetic work is simply called a network and a phylogenetic tree a tree. For sake of convenience for discussion, we also add an open edge entering the root of a network.

2.2 Visibility Properties

A node v in a network is *visible* (or stable) with respect to a leaf ℓ if v is in every path from the network root to ℓ. We say v visible if it is visible with respect to some leaf in the network.

Lemma 2.1 *Let N be a network and N' a subnetwork of N with the same root and leaves as N. Then, a node is visible in N' if it is visible in N. Equivalently, a node is not visible in N if it is not visible in N'.*

Proof Suppose $v \in \mathcal{V}(N)$ is visible with respect to a leaf ℓ in N. For each path P from $\rho(N')$ to ℓ, since it is also a path from $\rho(N)$ to ℓ in N, it must pass through v. Thus, v is also visible with respect to the same leaf in N'. □

Reticulation visible networks are networks in which reticulation nodes are all visible (Huson et al. 2011). They are also called stable networks by Gambette et al. (2015).

A network is *galled* if every reticulation node r has an ancestor a such that there are two disjoint tree paths from a to r (Huson and Kloepper 2007). Here, a path is tree path if its internal nodes are all tree nodes in the network. Galled networks are reticulation visible and are also known as level-1 networks.

Nearly-stable networks are networks in which for every pair of nodes u and v, either u or v is visible if (u, v) is an edge (Gambette et al. 2015).

Stable-child networks are networks in which every node has a visible child.

Tree-based networks comprise another interesting class of networks that is introduced recently (Francis and Steel 2015). A network is *tree-based* if it can be obtained from a tree with the same leaves by the insertion of a set of edges between different edges in the tree.

Theorem 2.2 (Gambette et al. 2015) *For every reticulation-visible network N, there exists a subset of edges $E \subseteq \mathcal{E}(N)$ such that E contains exactly an incoming edge for each reticulation node and $N - E$ is a subtree with the same leaves as N.*

Theorem 2.2 indicates that every reticulation visible network is tree-based. However, nearly-stable networks and stable-child networks are not necessarily tree-based.

We finish this section by presenting a technical lemma that will frequently be used in establishing the tight upper bound on the size of a network in each of the four classes defined above.

Lemma 2.3 *Let N be a network, $u \in \mathcal{V}(N)$, and R be a finite set of reticulation nodes below u. If each $r \in R$ has a parent $p(r)$ such that either* (a) *$p(r)$ is below another r' in R, or* (b) *there is a path from $\rho(N)$ to $p(r)$ that avoids u, then there exists a path from $\rho(N)$ to ℓ avoiding u for every leaf ℓ below a reticulation node $r \in R$.*

Proof Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(N)$. Assume ℓ is below some $r_1 \in R$. Then, there is a path $P(r_1, \ell)$ from r_1 to ℓ that avoids u. Since R is finite and N is acyclic, there exists a series of reticulation nodes, $r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_k$ such that:

(i) each r_j has a parent p_j below r_{j+1} for $j = 1, 2, \cdots, k-1$, and

(ii) the node r_k has a parent p_k such that there is a path $P(\rho(N), p_k)$ from $\rho(N)$ to p_k that avoids u.

Since p_j is below r_{j+1}, there exists a path $P(r_{j+1}, p_j)$ from r_{j+1} to p_j for each $j < k$. Since N is acyclic and r_{j+1} is below u, the path $P(r_{j+1}, p_j)$ avoids u. Concatenating these paths, we obtain the following path

$$P(\rho(N), p_k) + (p_k, r_k) + P(r_k, p_{k-1}) + (p_{k-1}, r_{k-1}) + \cdots + (p_1, r_1) + P(r_1, \ell)$$

from ρ to ℓ that avoids u. □

3 Reticulation visible networks

Gambette et al. (2015) proved that there are at most $4(n-1)$ reticulation nodes in a reticulation visible network with n labeled leaves. On the other hand, there are as many as $3(n-1)$ reticulations in the reticulation visible network in Figure 1. So, what is the tight upper bound on the number of reticulation nodes? Interestingly, $3(n-1)$ is the tight upper bound, which was independently proved by Bordewich and Semple (2015) using the induction approach. Here, we present an alternative proof to illustrate our approach.

Given a reticulation visible network N with n leaves, we let E be a set of edges such that $N-E$ is a subtree with the same root and leaves as N (Theorem 2.2). Since $N-E$ has n leaves, there are exactly $n-1$ nodes of degree 3. Thus, there are $2n-2$ paths whose internal nodes are of degree 2, starting at a degree-3 node and terminating at either another node of degree 3 or a leaf. Let these $2n-2$ paths be $P_1, P_2, \cdots, P_{2n-2}$.

The edges of $N-E$ not in $\cup_{1\leq i\leq 2n-2}\mathcal{E}(P_i)$ make up a path P_0 that contains the root $\rho(N)$ (Figure 1). If $\rho(N)$ is of degree 2, P_0 passes through $\rho(N)$ and terminates at a degree-3 node. If $\rho(N)$ is of degree 3, P_0 is simply the open edge entering $\rho(N)$. Altogether, these $2n-1$ paths are called the *trivial paths* of $N-E$. Note that $\mathcal{E}(N-E) = \uplus_{0\leq i\leq 2n-2}\mathcal{E}(P_i)$.

It is not hard to see that, for each edge in E, its head and tail are both found in these trivial paths. An edge $(u,v)\in E$ is called a *cross* edge if $u\in\mathcal{V}(P_i)$ and $v\in\mathcal{V}(P_j)$ for $i\neq j$; it is called *non-cross* edge otherwise. The facts in the following proposition appear in the proof of Theorem 1 in Gambette et al (2015).



Fig. 1 (**a**) A reticulation visible network with 4 leaves that has as many reticulation nodes as possible. (**b**) A subtree of the network that has the same leaves, in which only u_1, u_2, u_3 are of degree 3

Proposition 3.1 (1) *No two cross edges $e \in E$ have their heads in the same trivial path in $N - E$.*

(2) *For each non-cross edge (u, v) such that $u, v \in P_i$ for some $i \geq 0$, there are at least one cross edge $(w, x) \in E$ such that w is between u and v in P_i.*

For a cross edge (u, v) such that $u \in \mathcal{V}(P_i)$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}(P_j)(i \neq j)$, we say (u, v) *leaves* P_i and *enters* P_j. For a non-cross path (u, v) and a cross edge (w, x), if u and v are in P_i and w is a node between u and v in P_i, we say (u, v) *jumps over* (w, x).

It is trivial to see that no cross edge enters the trivial path P_0. Proposition 3.1 suggests that E contains at most $2n-2$ cross edges and thus at most $2n-2$ non-cross edges. By Theorem 2.2, $|\mathcal{R}(N)| = |E| \leq 4n-4$.

To obtain the tight upper bound $3n-3$ for $|\mathcal{R}(N)|$, we define the cost $c(e)$ of a cross edge $e \in E$ as:

$$c(e) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if there is an non-cross edge jumping over the tail of } e, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will charge the cost of a cross edge to the trivial path it enters and call it the *weight* of the trivial path. If no cross edge enters a trivial path, the weight of this trivial path is set to be 0. By Proposition 3.1, the weight of a trivial path is at most 2. We use $w(P_i)$ to denote the weight of a trivial path P_i, $0 \leq i \leq 2n-2$.

For an internal node t of degree 3 in $N-E$, we use P_{t3} to denote the trivial path entering t and P_{t1}, P_{t2} to denote the two trivial paths leaving t.

Proposition 3.2 *Let t be a degree-3 node in $N - E$.*



Fig. 2 Three cases that are considered in the proof of Proposition 3.2. P_{t1}, P_{t2}, P_{t3} are the three trivial paths incident to a degree-3 node t; (w_i, x_i) is the cross edge ending at v_i in P_{ti} and the non-cross edge (u_i, v_i) jumps over (w_i, x_i) for $i = 1, 2$. Here, (u_2, v_2) is not drawn. (**a**) w_1 and v_1 are both between t and x_2 in P_{t2}. (**b**) w_1 is between t and x_2 in P_{t2}, but v_1 is below x_2 in P_{t2}. (**c**) The node w_1 is below x_2 and w_2 is below x_1. This case is impossible to occur, as there is a directed cycle.

(i) *If* $P_{t3} \neq P_0$ *and* $w(P_{t1}) = w(P_{t2}) = 2$*, then* $w(P_{t3}) = 0$.
(ii) *If* $P_{t3} = P_0$*, then* $P_{t3} = 0$ *and* $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 3$.

Proof For sake of simplicity, we let $T = N - E$ and use $P_T(z', z'')$ to denote the unique path from z' to z'' for a node z' and a descendant z'' of z' in T. N and T have the same root and leaves. The common root of N and T is written ρ.

(i) Assume that $P_{t3} \neq P_0$ and $w(P_{t1}) = w(P_{t2}) = 2$. Then, there exists a cross edge (w_j, x_j) entering P_{tj} and a non-cross edge (u_j, v_j) jumping over (w_j, x_j) for each $j = 1, 2$. We shall prove that $w(P_{t3}) = 0$ by showing that no cross edge enters P_{t3}.

Assume w_1 is between t and x_2 in P_{t2}. When v_1 is below w_1 in $P_T(t, x_2)$ (Figure 2a), there are two cases. If w_2 is in the path P_{t1} or below it, then, $P_T(\rho, w_2)$ does not pass v_1. If w_2 is not below t, $P_T(\rho, w_2)$ does not pass t and so v_1. Therefore, by Lemma 2.3, there is path from ρ to every leaf below x_2 that does not pass v_1. For any leaf ℓ not below x_2 in T, $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ avoids v_1. Hence, v_1 is a reticulation node in N, but not visible. This is a contradiction.

When v_1 is below x_2 in T (Figure 2b), v_1 is below x_2 as a reticulation node. Since $P_T(\rho, u_1)$ does not pass x_2, by Lemma 2.3, there is a path from ρ to a leaf below x_2 that does not pass x_2. For any leaf ℓ not below x_2 in T, $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ avoids x_2. Hence, x_2 is not visible, a contradiction.

We have proved that w_1 is not between t and x_2 in the tree path P_{t2}. By symmetry, w_2 is not between t and x_1 in P_{t1}.

Assume there is a cross edge enters P_{t3}. Let r be the lowest reticulation node in P_{t3}. Then, w_1 and w_2 are both not in $P_T(r, t)$. Otherwise, either v_1 or v_2 is between r and t, contradicting that r is the lowest reticulation node in P_{t3}. Combining this fact with that w_j is not between t and x_{3-j} in T for $j = 1, 2$, we conclude that either w_j is below x_{3-j} or there is a path from ρ to w_j not passing r for each $j = 1, 2$. Hence, by Lemma 2.3, r is not visible with respect to any leaf below r. For any leaf ℓ not below r in T, the tree path $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ avoids r. Hence, r is not visible, a contradiction.

We have proved that $w(P_{t3}) = 0$.

(ii) If $P_{t3} = P_0$, then t is an ancestor of any other degree-3 node in $N - E$. Since N is acyclic, there does not exist $(u, v) \in E$ such that $u \in P_i$ for some $i > 0$ and $v \in P_0$. Hence, $w(P_0) = 0$.

Assume on the contrary the weights of P_{t1} and P_{t2} are both 2. Then, w_j is not between t and x_{3-j} for $j = 1, 2$, proved above. If w_1 or w_2 is in P_0, the lowest reticulation in P_0 is not visible, a contradiction. Otherwise, w_1 is below x_2 and w_2 is below x_1, implying a cycle in N (Figure 2c). This is a contradiction. Hence, either P_{t1} or P_{t2} has weight less than 2. □

Theorem 3.3 *Let* N *be a reticulation visible network with* n *leaves. Then,*

$$|\mathcal{R}(N)| \leq 3(n-1).$$

Proof Let V denote the set of $(n-1)$ internal nodes of degree 3 in $N - E$. Note that any trivial path other than P_0 starts with a node in V. Define:

$$V_k = \{v \in V \mid w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2}) = k\}$$

for $0 \leq k \leq 4$. Clearly, V_k's are pairwise disjoint and hence

$$|V_0| + |V_1| + |V_3| + |V_3| + |V_4| = |V| = n - 1.$$

When $v \in V_4$, $w(P_{v1}) = w(P_{v2}) = 2$. By Proposition 3.2, $P_{v3} \neq P_0$. Let $p(v)$ be the start node of P_{v3} for each $v \in V_4$. Again, by Proposition 3.2, $p(v) \in V_0 \cup V_1 \cup V_2$. It is clear that under the map $p(\cdot)$, at most two nodes in V_4 are mapped to the same node in V_0, and different nodes in V_4 are mapped to different nodes in $V_1 \cup V_2$. Thus, $|V_4| \leq 2|V_0| + |V_1| + |V_2|$. Since $w(P_0) = 0$, the inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(N)| &= \textstyle\sum_{v \in V}[w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2})] \\ &= |V_1| + 2|V_2| + 3|V_3| + (3|V_4| + |V_4|) \\ &\leq 2(|V_0| + |V_1|) + 3(|V_2| + |V_3| + |V_4|) \\ &\leq 3(|V_0| + |V_1| + |V_2| + |V_3| + |V_4|) \\ &= 3(n-1), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is derived from the substitution of $2|V_0| + |V_1| + |V_2|$ for $|V_4|$. □

4 Galled networks

Galled networks form a subclass of reticulation visible networks (Huson et al. 2011). In this section, we shall show that there are at most $2(n-1)$ reticulations in a galled network with n leaves. Given that the galled network shown in Figure 3a has exactly $2(n-1)$ reticulations, $2(n-1)$ is the tight bound on the number of reticulation nodes in a galled network with n leaves.

Theorem 4.1 *For a galled network N with n leaves, $|\mathcal{R}(N)| \leq 2(n-1)$.*



Fig. 3 (**a**) A galled network with 4 leaves that has as many reticulation nodes as possible. (**b**) and (**c**) are two cases considered in the proof of Theorem 4.1: there is a non-cross edge (u, v) in E such that u and v are in P_0, and there is a cross-edge edge (u_1, v_1) and a non-cross edge (u_2, v_2) both ending at a node in a trivial path other than P_0, where u_1 is not drawn. In (**b**) and (**c**), solid straight and curve arrows represent edges and paths in $N - E$, respectively; round dot arrows represent edges in E, respectively

Proof Let N be a galled network with n leaves and let $\rho = \rho(N)$. Since N is reticulation visible, by Theorem 2.2, there is a set of edges E such that (a) E contains exactly one incoming edge for each reticulation node and (b) $N - E$ is a subtree with the same leaves as N.

We use the same notation as in Section 3. P_0 denotes the trivial path whose first edge is the open edge entering ρ; $P_1, ..., P_{2n-2}$ denote the other $2n-2$ trivial paths in $N-E$. We prove the result by showing that E does not contain any non-cross edges and only one cross-edge can end at a node in each P_i for $i > 0$.

If P_0 contains only the open edge entering ρ, there is no edge in E that enters P_0. We first prove that this fact is also true even if P_0 contains other edges below ρ.

Since N is acyclic and there is a directed path from the end of P_0 to a node in P_i for any $i > 0$, there is no cross edge $(u, v) \in E$ such that u is in P_i and v is in P_0.

If there is a non-cross edge (u, v) such that u, v are in P_0 (Figure 3b), we let w be the other child of u in P_0. Then, w must be a tree node such that $(w, x) \in E$, where x is a reticulation node in some trivial path P_i, $i > 0$. (If w is a reticulation, it is not visible, a contradiction.) Since N is galled and x is a reticulation node, there exist two paths P' and P'' from a common tree node to x in N such that (i) they are internally disjoint and (2) x is the only reticulation node in them. Note that no edges in E other than (w, x) can appear in P' and P''. Otherwise, either P' and P'' contains another reticulation node. Thus, $P' + P'' - (w, x)$ is a subtree of $N - E$. This implies that one of P' and P'' is the single edge (w, x) and the other is $P_{N-E}(w, x)$, the unique path from w to x in the tree $N - E$. This is impossible, as the reticulation node v is in $P_{N-E}(w, x)$.

We have shown that there is no edge in E that enters P_0. Next, we show that there is at most one edge in E that enters P_i for each $1 \leq i \leq 2n - 2$.

Assume that (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) are two edges in E such that v_2 is below v_1 in some P_i $(i > 0)$ (Figure 3c). Then, (u_2, v_2) must be a non-cross edge and u_2 is also below v_1. (Otherwise, v_1 is not visible.) Again, by Fact (2) in Proposition 3.1, there is a cross edge (w, x) such that w is between u_2 and v_2 in P_i and x is in P_j, $j \neq i$. Since x is a reticulation node and N is galled, there are two internally disjoint paths P' and P'' from a common tree node to x in which any nodes other than x are a tree node. If $P' + P''$ contains an edge in E other than (w, x), the head of the edge is a reticulation node and appears in either P' or P'', a contradiction. Hence, $P' + P'' - (w, x)$ is a subtree of T. Without loss of generality, we may assume P' contains (w, x). That is, (w, x) is the last edge of P'. Note that v_1, u_2, w, v_2 are all nodes in P_i, ordered from top to bottom. If P' contains more than one edge in T, it must pass through v_1, a contradiction. If P' is equal to (w, x), then P'' must pass through v_2, a contradiction. Therefore, there is at most one edge in E whose head is in each trivial path P_i, $i > 0$.

In summary, there are $2n - 2$ trivial paths other than P_0 and there is at most one edge in E entering each of them. Hence, $|\mathcal{R}(N)| = |E| \leq 2(n-1)$. □

5 Nearly-stable network

In this section we will give a tight bound for the number of reticulations in a nearly-stable network. The class of nearly-stable networks is different from the class of reticulation visible networks, but surprisingly the tight upper bound is also $3(n-1)$. The network shown in Figure 4a is an example for a nearly-stable network with $3(n-1)$ reticulations. We need the following fact, proved by Gambette et al. (2015).

Proposition 5.1 *Let N be a nearly-stable network with n leaves. There exists a set E of edges such that* (a) *$N-E$ is a reticulation visible subnetwork over the same leaves as N, and* (b) *E contains exactly one incoming edge for each reticulation node that is not visible in N.*

Let E be the set of edges satisfying the two properties in Proposition 5.1 and let $N' = N - E$ (Figure 4a). The edges in E are said to be NS-*edges*. We remark that N' is a subdivision of a binary reticulation visible network. That is, the reticulation visible network can be obtained from N' by replacing some paths whose internal nodes are of degree 2 with directed edges with the same orientation. Hence, N' contains degree-2 nodes if E is not empty.

For a path P, we use $\mathcal{IV}(P)$ to denote the set of its internal nodes. Since N' is a subdivision of a binary reticulation visible network with the same leaves as N, by Theorem 2.2, there is a set $\mathcal{P}$ of paths in N' such that (i) each path $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is from a degree-3 tree node to a visible reticulation node in N' and its internal nodes are all of degree-2 in N', and (ii) $N' - \cup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{IV}(P) - \cup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{E}(P)$ is a subtree with the same leaves as N.

Let $T = N' - \cup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{IV}(P) - \cup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{E}(P)$. T is obtained from the removal of the internal nodes and edges of the paths in $\mathcal{P}$. We can classify the paths in $\mathcal{P}$ as *cross paths* and *non-cross paths* accordingly as in Section 3 (Figure 4b).



Fig. 4 (**a**) A nearly-stable network N with four leaves. It has nine reticulations (shaded circles), five of which are not visible. The round dot edges are those removed to obtain the reticulation visible network N' in (**b**). The dashed paths in N' are the cross and non-cross paths removed to obtain a subtree with the same leaves as N. (**c**) and (**d**) are two cases considered in the proof of the part (c) in Lemma 5.2: a non-cross path from u and v contains a tree node z of N, and it contains a reticulation node z of N

Lemma 5.2 *Let N be a nearly-stable network and let E, N', T and $\mathcal{P}$ be defined above.*

(a) *Every internal node in a path in $\mathcal{P}$ is not visible in N.*

(b) *Each cross path in $\mathcal{P}$ consists of either a single edge or two edges in N.*

(c) *Each non-cross path in $\mathcal{P}$ is simply an edge in N.*

(d) *If P is a cross path in $\mathcal{P}$ from w to x and P' is a non-cross path in $\mathcal{P}$ from u to v such that w is between u and v (Figure 4b), then P and P' are both a single edge in N.*

(e) *Every two distinct paths in $\mathcal{P}$ are node disjoint.*

Proof We remark that $P_T(x, y)$ denotes the unique path from x to y for any two nodes x and y in T.

(a) Let P be a path in $\mathcal{P}$ and let y be an internal node of it. For any leaf $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(T)$, the unique path $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass y in T. Hence, y is not visible in N.

(b) If there are two or more internal nodes in a path in $\mathcal{P}$, by (a), they are consecutive and not visible in N, contradicting that N is nearly-stable.

(c) We use ρ to denote the root of N, which is also the root of N' and T. Let P be a non-cross path between u and v, where u and v are in some path P_i in T. Note that $P_T(u, v)$ is a sub-path of P_i and is internally disjoint from P. By Fact (2) in Proposition 3.1, there is an internal node w in $P_T(u, v)$ that is the start node of a cross path $P(w, x)$ in $\mathcal{P}$.

First, any node y between u and v in $P_T(u, v)$ is not visible. This is because for any network leaf ℓ not below v in T, $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass through y, and for any network leaf ℓ below v in T, $P_T(\rho, \ell) - P_T(u, v) + P$ is a path not passing through y. Therefore, w must be the unique internal node of $P_T(u, v)$. That is, w is the child of u and the parent of v in $P_T(u, v)$.

Assume that P is not an edge in N. By (a), there is a unique degree-2 node z between u and v in P. We consider the following two cases.

If $z \in \mathcal{T}(N)$ (Figure 4c), then the other outgoing edge (z, z') had been removed to obtain N'. That is, $(z, z') \in E$. By the definition of E, z' is a reticulation node and not visible in N. That z and z' are both not visible contradicts that N is nearly-stable.

If $z \in \mathcal{R}(N)$ (Figure 4d), then the other incoming edge (z'', z) had been removed to obtain N'. Note that $z'' \neq u$ and $z'' \neq w$, as w has degree 3 in N'. In addition, z'' is not an internal node of a path in $\mathcal{P}$. (Otherwise, by (a), z and z'' are both not visible). So z'' is a node in T. Clearly z'' is not below v and hence not below w in T. (Otherwise N has a cycle.) Hence, $P_T(\rho, z'')$ does not pass through u.

Consider a network leaf $\ell \in \mathcal{L}(N)$. If it is not below v, then $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass through u. If ℓ is below v, then $P_T(\rho, z'') + (z'', z) + (z, v) + P_T(v, \ell)$ is a path not passing through u in N. Therefore, u is not visible. That u and w are both not visible in N contradicts that N is nearly-stable.



Fig. 5 The two cases considered in the proof of Lemma 5.3. Solid arrows and curves represent the edges and paths in T, while square dot arrows and curves represent the removed edges and paths. f_1 is the reticulation child of t in a trivial path P_{t1} leaving t. f_2 is the child of t in the trivial path P_{t2}. The path from w_2 to x_2 is a cross path entering x_2. (**a**) A cross path from w_1 to x_1 and f is a node between t and x_1, where x_1 is in P_{t1}. (**b**) The unique tree node f_2 between t and x_2 is also a parent of f_1 in N

(d) By the proof of (c), P' is a single edge in N and w is the only node in P and not visible. Thus P must be an edge in N. (Otherwise by (a) w and its child in P are not visible, contradicting that N is nearly-stable.)

(e) It can be easily derived from the definition of the cross path. □

Let $C \in \mathcal{P}$ be a cross path from w to x. Then, x is a visible reticulation node in N. It may have as many as two reticulation parents that are not visible. Let $U_x = parent(x) \cap \mathcal{UR}(N)$, where $parent(x)$ is the set of all parents of x and $\mathcal{UR}(N)$ is the set of all reticulation nodes that are not visible in N. $|U_x| = 0, 1$, or 2. Define the cost of C as:

$$c(C) = \begin{cases} 2 + |U_x| & \text{if there is a non-cross edge jumping over } w, \\ 1 + |U_x| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where 2 is used to count x and the other child of w which is a visible reticulation node if there is a non-cross edge jumping over w.

As in Section 3, we let P_0 denote the trivial path whose first edge is the incoming edge to ρ and let $P_1, ..., P_{2n-2}$ denote the other $2n-2$ trivial paths in T. We charge the cost of a cross path to the trivial path P_i in T in which the cross path enters and call it the weight of P_i. The weight of P_i is denoted by $w(P_i)$. If a trivial path does not contain any end node of the cross paths in $\mathcal{P}$, its weight is set to be 0.

Each visible reticulation node contributes to at least one unit of weight. By the definition of nearly-stable networks, any reticulation node that is not visible must have a visible reticulation node as its child, and by the proof of Lemma 5.2 (c), any reticulation node that is not visible in N must be in some U_x, x being the end node of a cross path, so it also contributes to at least one unit weight. Therefore, $|\mathcal{R}(N)| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{2n-2} w(P_i)$. To bound this, we first establish a useful lemma.

As in Section 3, we use P_{t3} to denote the trivial path entering t and P_{t1}, P_{t2} to denote the trivial paths leaving t for a node t of degree 3 in T.

Lemma 5.3 *Let P_{tj} be a trivial path defined above and let C_j be a cross path from w_j to x_j, where x_j is in P_{tj} and $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Define $j' = 3 - j$.*

(a) *The tree path $P_T(t, x_j)$ consists of either a single edge or two edges in P_{tj}. If $P_T(t, x_j)$ includes two edges, the internal node is not visible.*

(b) *If there exists a node f_j between t and x_j in P_{tj} and f_j is a reticulation node in N, then no cross-path enters the other trivial path $P_{tj'}$.*

(c) *Assume that C_j contains an internal node that is a reticulation node in N. If there is a cross-path $C_{j'}$ from $w_{j'}$ to $x_{j'}$ such that $x_{j'}$ is in $P_{tj'}$, then w_j is not in $P_T(t, x_{j'})$.*

Proof Note that $\{j, 3-j\} = \{1, 2\}$ for $j = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $P_{tj} = P_{t1}$ and $P_{tj'} = P_{t2}$, that is $j = 1$ and $j' = 3 - j = 2$.

(a) Let f be a node between t and x_1 in P_{t1} (Figure 5a) and let ℓ be a leaf in N. If ℓ is not below x_1 in T, the path $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass through f.

Let ℓ be a leaf below x_1 in T. Since w_1 is not in P_{t1} in T, the tree path $P_T(\rho, w_1)$ does not pass f. By Lemma 2.3 there is a path from ρ to ℓ that avoids f. Therefore, f is not visible.

Since N is nearly-stable, there is at most one node in $P_T(t, x_1)$, as each internal node is not visible.

(b) Suppose on the contrary, there is a cross path C_2 from w_2 to x_2 entering P_{t2}, where x_2 is in P_{t2}. By (a), x_2 is a child of t or there is a unique node f_2 between t and x_2 in P_{t2}. We first show that t is not visible in N.

If x_2 is a child of t or there is a node f_2 in $P_T(t, x_2)$ such that f_2 is a reticulation node in N, t has two reticulation children in N. By Lemma 2.3, t is not visible.

If P_{t2} contains a node f_2 between t and x_2 in N, (f_2, f_1) must not be an edge in N. Otherwise, as shown in Figure 5b, f_1 and f_2 are then not visible, contradicting that N is nearly-stable.

Let (y_1, f_1) be the edge removed from f_1 in the process of transforming N to N'. Since $y_1 \neq f_2$, either y_1 is below x_2 or there is a path from ρ to y_1 that avoids t.

Since w_2 is in another trivial path and there is no node between t and f_1 in P_{t1}, w is either below f_1 or the path $P_T(\rho, w_2)$ does not pass t.

Since the reticulation nodes f_1, x_2 are below t and satisfy the condition in Lemma 2.3, there is a path from ρ to ℓ that avoids t for any leaf ℓ below f_1 or x_2. For any leaf ℓ below neither f_1 nor x_2, it is not below t and the path $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass through t. Therefore, t is also not visible.

The fact that t and f_1 are both not visible contradicts that N is nearly-stable. This implies that there is no cross path entering P_{t2}.

(c) If x_2 is the child of t in P_{t2}, the case is trivial.

Assume that there is an internal node f_2 between t and x_2 in P_{t2}. By the fact (a), f_2 is not visible. If $w_1 = f_2$, then w_1 and its child in P_1 are both not visible, contradicting N is nearly-stable network. □

Proposition 5.4 *For an internal node t of degree 3 in T,*

(a) *$w(P_{t1}) \leq 3$ and $w(P_{t2}) \leq 3$.*

(b) *if $w(P_{tj}) = 3$, then $w(P_{t(3-j)}) = 0$, where $j \in \{1, 2\}$.*

(c) *if* $P_{t3} \neq P_0$ *and* $w(P_{t1}) = w(P_{t2}) = 2$*, then* $w(P_{t3}) = 0$*. Moreover, assume* $p(t)$ *is the degree-3 ancestor of* t *such that* $P_{t3} = P_{p(t)1}$*. Then* $w(P_{p(t)2}) \leq 2$.

(d) *if* $P_{t3} = P_0$*, then* $w(P_{t3}) = 0$ *and* $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 3$.

Proof (a) We only prove that $w(P_{t1}) \leq 3$. If there is no non-cross edge jumping over the start node of the cross path entering P_{t1}, by Eqn. (1), the weight of P_{t1} is at most 3.

If there is a non-cross edge jumping over the start node w_1 of the cross-path C_1 ending at a node x_1 in P_{t1}, by the fact (d) of Lemma 5.2, C_1 is equal to the single edge (w_1, x_1). Therefore, x_1 has at most one reticulation parent, which is in P_{t1} if exists. By Eqn. (1), $w(P_{t1}) \leq 3$.

(b) Assume $w(P_{t1}) = 3$. Then, there is a cross path C_1 from w_1 to x_1 where x_1 is in P_{t1}. If there is no non-cross edge jumping over w_1, by Eqn. (1), x_1 has two reticulation parents (Figure 6a).

If there is a non-cross edge jumping over w_1, by the fact (d) of Lemma 5.2, C_1 is equal to a single edge (w_1, x_1), and by Eqn. (1), x_1 has one reticulation parent f_1 in P_{t1} (Figure 6b). By the fact (b) of Lemma 5.3, there is no cross path that enters P_{t2}, implying $w(P_{t2}) = 0$.

(c) Assume $P_{t3} \neq P_0$ and $w(P_{t1}) = w(P_{t2}) = 2$. Let C_j be the cross path from w_j to x_j, with x_j in $P_{tj}, j = 1, 2$. Since $w(P_{t1}) = w(P_{t2}) = 2$, by the fact (b) of Lemma 5.3, there is no reticulation node between t and x_j for each j. Hence, for each j, either the parent of x_j in C_j is a reticulation node and not visible (Figure 6c), or there is a non-cross edge (u_i, v_i) jumping over w_i (Figure 6e).

By the facts (a) and (b) of Lemma 5.3, either x_j is the child of t in P_{tj} or there is a tree node f_j between t and x_j in P_{tj} for $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Assume that there is a tree node f_j between t and x_j in P_{tj}, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $j' = 3 - j$. If $C_{j'}$ has an internal node that is a reticulation, by the fact (c) of Lemma 5.3, $w_{j'} \neq f_j$.

If there is a non-cross edge jumping over $w_{j'}$, by the fact (d) of Lemma 5.2, that $w_{j'} = f_j$ implies that the endpoints of the non-cross edge are also between t and x_j. This is impossible, as there is only f_j between t and x_j. Therefore, $w_{j'} \neq f_j$. Similarly, $w_j \neq f_{j'}$.



Fig. 6 (**a**)-(**b**) Two types of trivial paths of weight 3. (**c**)-(**e**) Three types of trivial paths of weight 2. Solid arrows and curves represent the edges and paths in T, while square dot arrows and curves represent the removed edges and paths. The path from w_1 to x_1 is the cross path ending at a node in a trivial path leaving t

We have proved that for $j = 1, 2$, w_j is not between t and $x_{j'}$. Thus, w_j is either below $x_{j'}$ or there is a path from ρ to w_j that does not pass t. Therefore, by Lemma 2.3, there is a path from ρ to ℓ not passing through t for any leaf below either x_1 or x_2. For any leaf ℓ below neither x_1 nor x_2, since it is not below t in T, $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not contain t. Therefore, t is not visible. This also implies that x_1 and x_2 are children of t.

Assume $p(t)$ is the start node of P_{t3} and $P_{t3} = P_{p(t)1}$. We further prove that P_{t3} consists of only an edge $(p(t), t)$ in N.

Assume on the contrary there are nodes between $p(t)$ and t in $P_{p(t)1}$. We consider the parent y ($\neq p(t)$) of t in the trivial path $P_{p(t)1}$. If y is a reticulation node, that t is not visible implies that y is also not visible, a contradiction. Hence y must be a tree node in N. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1. y is equal to w_j or equal to the other parent of the internal node of C_j for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $j = 1$ (Figure 7a and b). This implies that there is no non-cross edge jumping over the cross path C_1 and there is a reticulation node z_1 in C_1.

When $y = w_1$, let (z_1', z_1) be the edge removed from z_1 in the first stage. Since z_1' is a parent of z_1, if z_1' is below y, it must be below x_2. When $y \neq w_1$, w_1 is below x_2 if it is below y.

Similarly, w_2 is below x_1 and thus below z_1 if it is below y.

The set of reticulation nodes $\{z_1, x_2\}$ and y and satisfy the condition in Lemma 2.3, so there is path from ρ to ℓ that avoids y for any leaf ℓ below z_1 and x_2. If ℓ is below neither z_1 nor x_2, it is not below y, and $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass through y. Hence, y is not visible.

Case 2. y is neither w_j nor the other parent of the internal node of C_j for each $j = 1, 2$ (Figure 7c).

In this case, for each $j = 1, 2$, x_j is either below $x_{j'}$ or there is a path from ρ to w_j that avoids y. Applying Lemma 2.3 on the set of reticulations $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and y, we conclude that there is a path from ρ to ℓ that avoids y for any leaf ℓ below x_1 or x_2. Clearly, for any leaf ℓ not below x_1 or x_2, $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ avoids y. Therefore, y must be not visible. That y and t are two consecutive nodes and not visible contradicts that N is nearly-stable.

After proving that the path $P_{p(t)1}$ is actually an edge $(p(t), t)$, we now prove that $w(P_{p(t)2}) \leq 2$. Assume on the contrary $w(P_{p(t)2}) \geq 3$. Then, the child f_3 of $p(t)$ in $P_{p(t)2}$ must be a reticulation node (Figure 7d). Then, the set of reticulations $\{f_3, x_1, x_2\}$ and $p(t)$ satisfy the conditions in Lemma 2.3, so there exists a path from ρ to ℓ that does not pass through $p(t)$ for any leaf ℓ below $p(t)$ in T. For any leaf ℓ not below $p(t)$, the tree path $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ does not pass through $p(t)$. Hence, $p(t)$ is not visible. That $p(t)$ and t are not visible contradicts that N is nearly-stable network.

(d) If $P_{t3} = P_0$, then t is an ancestor of any degree-3 node in T. Since N is acyclic, there does not exist any cross path $C \in \mathcal{P}$ from w to x, such that $x \in P_0$ while $w \in P_i$ for $i > 0$. Hence $w(P_0) = 0$.

If the weight of P_{t1} and P_{t2} are both 2, and if w_i is the start node of the cross path C_i that enters P_{ti} for $i = 1, 2$, either w_1 or w_2 is a node in P_0.



Fig. 7 The four cases that are considered in the proof of the fact (c) in Proposition 5.4. The path from w_i to x_i is a cross path ending at x_i in a trivial path P_{ti} leaving t for $i = 1, 2$. (**a**) w_1 is an internal node in P_{t3}. (**b**) y is the other parent of the unique internal node of the cross path from w_1 to x_1. (**c**) neither w_1 nor w_2 is equal to y and has a common child with y. (**d**) $p(t)$ is the parent of t and has a reticulation node f_3 as the other child. Solid arrows and curves represent the edges and paths in T, round dot arrows represent edges in E that were removed to form N', and square dot arrows and curves represent the edges and paths that were removed to transform N' to T.

Following the proof of fact (c), we conclude that t and its parent in P_0 are both not visible, a contradiction. □

Theorem 5.5 *Let N be a nearly-stable network with n leaves. Then, $|\mathcal{R}(N)| \leq 3(n-1)$.*

Proof Let V denote the set of internal nodes of degree 3 in T, and let

$$V_i = \{v \in V \mid w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2}) = i\}.$$

For any $v \in V$, we define $p(v)$ to be the start node of the trivial path P_{v3} that enters v. By Proposition 5.4 (c) and (d), that $v \in V_4$ implies $p(v) \in V_0 \cup V_1 \cup V_2$. Additionally, there are at most two different nodes v' and v'' in V_4 such that $p(v') = p(v'') \in V_0$, as there are only two trivial paths leaving a degree-3 tree node in T; for different v' and v'', if $p(v')$ and $p(v'')$ are in $V_1 \cup V_2$, then $p(v') \neq p(v'')$. Taken together, the two facts imply that $|V_4| \leq 2|V_0|+|V_1|+|V_2|$.

Since $w(P_0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}(N)| &= \textstyle\sum_{v \in V}[w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2})] \\ &= |V_1| + 2|V_2| + 3|V_3| + 4|V_4| \\ &\leq 2|V_0| + 2|V_1| + 3|V_2| + 3|V_3| + 3|V_4| \\ &\leq 3(|V_0| + |V_1| + |V_2| + |V_3| + |V_4|) \\ &= 3(n-1). \end{aligned}$$

□

6 Stable-child network

The stable-child network shown in Figure 8a has as many as $7(n-1)$ reticulation nodes. In this section, we shall prove that a stable-child network can have $7(n-1)$ reticulation nodes at most.



Fig. 8 (**a**) A stable-child network with 2 leaves that has as many reticulation nodes as possible. In a stable-child network, there are three possible local structures at a reticulation node r if it is not visible: (**b**) r and its child c have a common parent. (**c**) r has a parent p and a sibling r' under p such that r' and p has a common parent w. (**d**) Neither (**b**) nor (**c**) is true. (**e**) Both (**b**) and (**C**) occur at the same time

We first transform a stable-child network to a reticulation visible network and then to a binary tree with the same leaves by removing some edges into reticulations nodes.

Proposition 6.1 *Let N be a stable-child network. There is a set of edges E such that* (1) *$N - E$ is a subdivision of a reticulation visible network over the same leaves as N, and* (2) *E contains exactly an incoming edge for a reticulation node if it is not visible in N.*

Proof For a reticulation node r that is not visible in N, its unique child must be a visible reticulation node. Furthermore, since each node has a visible child, its parents both have a visible child other than r and are both a tree node. To transform N into a reticulation visible network, we will delete one or two edges around a reticulation if it is not visible.

For each reticulation node r that is not visible, we consider the following three cases. If r and its unique child c have a common parent p (Figure 8b), then (p, r) is removed.

If r and its child c do not have a common parent, but r has a reticulation sibling r' such that the parent w of the common parent p of r and r' is the other parent of r' (Figure 8c), (p, r) and (w, r') are then deleted at the same time.

When neither occurs (Figure 8d), we arbitrarily select an incoming edge of r to remove.

The edges removed in the above process is called *SC-edges*. Each SC-edge is from a tree node to a reticulation node. A SC-edge is *concealed* if the head is a visible reticulation node; it is *revealed* otherwise. Note that a concealed SC-edge is deleted only when the case shown in Figure 8c is satisfied. Therefore, a concealed SC-edge jumps over the associated revealed SC-edge that is removed at the same time. It is not hard to see that the SC-edges that are removed when different reticulation nodes are considered are different. Let E be the set of SC-edges.

First, we only deleted an incoming edge for each reticulation node and did not delete the incoming edge for each tree node, so the resulting network $N-E$ is connected. Second, $N-E$ has the same leaves as N. The reasons for this include that (i) we do not remove any outgoing edge of a reticulation node, and (ii) for any tree node t, if an outgoing edge of it is removed, the other outgoing edge enters another tree node and thus has never not been removed.

Now, we show that $N-E$ is a subdivision of a binary reticulation visible network. Since we had deleted an incoming edge for a reticulation node if it is not visible, all the remaining reticulation nodes are visible. $N-E$ is reticulation visible. We can also show that there are no two internally disjoint paths from a common tree node to a common reticulation node in which each internal node is of degree 2, implying that $N-E$ is a subdivision of a binary reticulation visible network.

Assume on the contrary there are two internally disjoint path P_1 and P_2 between u and v such that their internal nodes are all of degree 2. If neither P_1 nor P_2 is a single edge, then the two children of u in P_1 and P_2 are both not visible, contradicting that N is a stable-child network. Therefore, either P_1 or P_2 is a single edge from u and v.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that P_2 is equal to the edge (u,v). According to the three rules which we used to remove the edges in E, if an incoming edge of a node is removed, its child in $N-E$ is visible in N. This implies that $N-E$ does not contain a path consisting of two or more degree-2 nodes that are not visible in N. Therefore, P_1 has exactly one internal node x. If x is a tree node in N, then, we removed an outgoing edge of x according to either the second or third case. In the former case, we remove (u,v) at the same time. In the later case, (u,v) does not exist in N. This is impossible. When x is a reticulation node, we removed an incoming edge of it. Again, the edge (u,v) does not exist in N in each possible case, a contradiction.

We have proved that $N-E$ is a subdivision of a binary network. □

Let $N' = N-E$ be the subnetwork obtained after the removal of the edges in E. N' is a subdivision of a reticulation visible network. By Theorem 2.2, there exist a set of paths $\mathcal{P}$ such that (i) $T := N-E-\cup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{IV}(P)-\cup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{E}(P)$ is a subtree of N with the same leaves and (ii) all the internal nodes in each path in $\mathcal{P}$ are of degree 2.

Again, we use $P_0, P_1, ..., P_{2n-2}$ to denote the trivial paths in T, where P_0 denotes the trivial path starting with $\rho(N)$. As in the last section, a path in $\mathcal{P}$ is called a non-cross path if its start and end nodes are both in P_j for some j; it is called a cross path otherwise.

Lemma 6.2 *Let P be a path in $\mathcal{P}$.*

(a) *Every internal node in P is not visible in N.*

(b) *If P is a non-cross path, it is simply an edge.*

(c) *If P is a cross path and ends at a node x in the trivial path P_j, every node between the start node of P_j and x in T is not visible in N.*

(d) *If P is a cross path and there is a non-cross path P' jumping over it, then either P is an edge or the start node of P is the parent of the end node of P' in T.*

Proof (a) and (b) are essentially the restatement of the fact (a) and (c) in Lemma 5.2.

(c) Let y be a node between the start node of P_j and x in T. For any leaf ℓ that is not below x in T, $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ is a path that does not pass x and hence y. For any leaf ℓ below x in T, the path $P_T(\rho, w) + P + P_T(x, \ell)$ avoids y, as w is the start node of P in a trivial path different from P_j. Hence, y is not visible in N.

(d) By (b), P' is simply an edge (u, v) in N'. Let P start at a node w. If neither $P_T(w, v)$ nor P is a single edge, the two children of w in P and $P_T(w, v)$ are both not visible, contradicting that N is stable-child. □

Let r be a reticulation node and not visible in N. Then, a revealed SC-edge e_r was removed from r to obtain N' from N. We define the cost $c(r)$ of r to be:

$$c(r) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if a concealed SC-edge is associated with } e_r, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that $U_s = \mathit{parent}(s) \cap \mathcal{UR}(N)$. We can define the cost of a cross path $C \in \mathcal{P}$ from w to x as follows:

$$c(C) = \begin{cases} 2 + \displaystyle\sum_{r \in U_x \cup U_v} c(r) & \text{if a non-cross edge } (u, v) \text{ jumps over } w, \\ 1 + \displaystyle\sum_{r \in U_x} c(r) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

We further charge the cost of C to the trivial path P_i to which x belongs and call it the weight of P_i, written $w(P_i)$. If there is no cross path entering P_i, the weight of P_i is set to be 0.

As for nearly-stable networks, we have that $|\mathcal{R}(N)| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{2n-2} w(P_i)$.

For an internal node t with degree-3 in T, we still use P_{t1} and P_{t2} to denote the trivial paths leaving t and P_{t3} to denote the trivial path entering t.

Proposition 6.3 *For each internal node t of degree 3 in T,*

(a) $w(P_{tj}) \leq 6$, $j = 1, 2$.

(b) $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 10$.

(c) *If $P_{t3} \neq P_0$ and $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \geq 8$, then $w(P_{t3}) = 0$. Moreover, assume $p(t)$ is the start node of P_{t3} and $P_{t3} = P_{p(t)1}$. Then $w(P_{p(t)2}) \leq 4$.*

(d) *If $P_{t3} = P_0$, then $w(P_{t3}) = 0$ and $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 7$.*

Proof (a) We will only prove that $P_{t1} \leq 6$. Let C_1 denote the cross path sending at a node x_1 in P_{t1}. Let w_1 be the start node of C_1 in a trivial path different from P_{t1}. Note that $U_s = \mathcal{UR}(N) \cap \mathit{parent}(s)$.

If there is no non-cross edge jumping over w_1, then there are at most 2 elements in U_{x_1}, and each element can have two unit cost at most. Thus, by Eqn. (2), $w(P_{t1}) \leq 5$.

If there is a non-cross edge (u_1, v_1) jumping over w_1. By the fact (b) in Lemma 6.2, U_{v_1} is empty or a singleton. Moreover, by the fact (d) in Lemma 6.2 (d), either C_1 is an edge, or (w_1, v_1) is an edge in T. If C_1 is an edge, then $|U_{x_1}| \leq 1$. If (w_1, v_1) is an edge, $|U_{v_1}| = 0$. Both implies that $|U_{x_1}| + |U_{v_1}| \leq 2$. Therefore, by Eqn. (2), $w(P_{t1}) \leq 2 + 2(|U_x| + |U_v|) \leq 6$.

We remark that, if the parent of x_1 in T is not a reticulation node in N, then $|U_{x_1}| + |U_{v_1}| \leq 1$, and therefore $w(P_{t1}) \leq 4$. Equality holds only if there is a non-cross edge jumping over x.

(b) If $w(P_{t1}) \neq 0$ and $w(P_{t2}) \neq 0$, we assume that the cross path C_i ending at a node x_1 in P_{ti} starts at w_i for $i = 1, 2$. By the fact (c) of Lemma 6.2, every internal node in $P_T(t, x_1)$ and $P_T(t, x_2)$ is not visible. If there is a node between t and x_i for each i, then the two children of t are not visible in N, contradicting that N is stable-child. So t is the parent of either x_1 or x_2. Without loss of generality, we may assume that t is the parent of x_1 in T. By the remark in the end of the proof of (a), $w(P_{t1}) \leq 4$ and hence $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 4 + 6 = 10$.

(c) Assume that $P_{t3} \neq P_0$ and $p(t)$ be the start node of P_{t3} such that $P_{t3} = P_{p(t)1}$. If $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \geq 8$, by (a), the weights of P_{t1} and P_{t2} are both not zero. Hence, there is a cross path C_i ending at a node x_i in P_{ti} and starting at a node w_i in a trivial path different from P_{ti} for each $i = 1, 2$.

We first show that w_i either (i) below x_{3-i}, or (ii) neither in P_{t3} nor below t for $i = 1$ and 2. Without loss of generality, we assume $i = 1$.

Case 1. w_1 is in $P_T(t, x_2)$ (Figure 9a).

If there is a non-cross edge (u_1, v_1) jumping over w_1, v_1 is either in $P_T(w_1, x_2)$ or v_1 is below x_2 in P_{t2}. The former implies that v_1 is not visible, whereas the latter implies that x_2 is not visible. This contradicts that both v_1 and x_2 are visible in N'.

Since w_1 is an internal node between t and x_2 in T, then t is the parent of x_1 in T. By the fact (a) and (c) of Lemma 6.2, each internal node in C_1 or $P_T(w_1, x_2)$ is not visible. Thus, (w_1, x_1) or (w_1, x_2) is an edge. Otherwise, the two children of w_1 are not visible, contradicting N is stable-child network.

If (w_1, x_1) is an edge in N, then $w(P_{t1}) = 1$ and hence $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 7$, a contradiction. If (w_1, x_2) is an edge, then $w(P_{t1}) \leq 3$. Since w_1 is not a reticulation, by the remark at the end of the proof of (a), $w(P_{t2}) \leq 4$. Therefore, $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 7$. This is impossible.

Case 2. w_1 is a node in the path P_{t3}.

Without loss of generality, we can assume w_1 is lower than w_2 if w_2 is also in P_{t3}. We claim that t and all the internal nodes in $P_T(w_1, t)$ are not visible. Let u be either t or an internal node in $P_T(w_1, t)$. If w_2 is in $P_T(t, x_1)$, the case is symmetric to Case 1. So there are two cases to consider: either w_2 is below x_1 (Figure 9b), or w_2 is not below w_1 (Figure 9c). In both cases, the reticulation node set $\{x_1, x_2\}$ are below the node u, and satisfies the condition in Lemma 2.3, so u is not visible with respect to each leaf ℓ below either x_1 or x_2. For any leaf ℓ not below x_1 or x_2, the path $P_T(\rho, \ell)$ avoids u. Hence u is not visible in N.

There are some observations from this result. First, there is no non-cross edge (u_1, v_1) jumping over w_1, otherwise v_1 is not visible. Second, a child of



Fig. 9 Four cases that are considered in the proof of Proposition 6.3. (**a**) w_1 is between t and x_2. (**b**) w_1 is the trivial path P_{t3} entering t, and w_2 is below x_1. (**c**) w_1 is in P_{t3}, and w_2 is not below x_1. (**d**) w_1 is below w_2 and w_2 is also below x_1. This is impossible in a network

w_1 in P_{t3} is not visible, and so the cross path C_1 is simply an edge. Otherwise by the fact (a) of Lemma 6.2, the two children of w_1 are both not visible in N.

By (b) of Lemma 6.2, either (t, x_1) or (t, x_2) is an edge in T. If t is the parent of x_1 in T, then $w(P_{t1}) = 1$ according to Eqn. (2). By (a), $w(P_{t1})+w(P_{t2}) \leq 7$. If t is the parent of x_2, $w(P_{t1}) \leq 3$ and $w(P_{t2}) \leq 4$ according to the remark at the end of the proof of (a). Taken together, both facts imply that $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \leq 7$, which contradicts the assumption that $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \geq 8$.

Case 3. w_1 is below x_2 and w_2 is below x_1 (Figure 9d).

This case is impossible since there is a cycle in N, contradicting N is acyclic.

To sum up, $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \geq 8$ implies that either (i) or (ii) is true. But in both cases, if we let u be either t or any internal node in P_{t3}, the set of reticulations $\{x_1, x_2\}$ are below u and satisfies the condition in Lemma 2.3. Therefore, t and any internal node of P_{t3} are not visible.

There are two observations from this result. First, $w(P_{t3}) = 0$ because there is no cross path that ends at P_{t3}. (Otherwise the cross path enters P_{t3} at a reticulation that is not visible in N.) Second, the child of $p(t)$ in $P_{t3} = P_{p(t)1}$ is not visible.

Clearly, $w(P_{p(t)2}) = 0$ if there is no cross path that ends at $P_{p(t)2}$. Assume there is a cross path C_3 from w_3 to x_3 with x_3 in $P_{p(t)2}$. By (c) of Lemma 6.2, each internal node in $P_T(p(t), x_3)$ is not visible. But the child of $p(t)$ in $P_{p(t)1}$ is not visible. Hence, $(p(t), x_3)$ is an edge in T. Then, by the remark in the end of proof of (a), $w(P_{p(t)2}) \leq 4$.

(d) If $P_{t3} = P_0$, then t is an ancestor of any degree-3 node in T. Since N is acyclic, there does not exist any cross path $P(u, v) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $u \in P_i$ for $i > 0$ and $v \in P_0$. Hence, $w(P_0) = 0$.

If $w(P_{t1}) + w(P_{t2}) \geq 8$, then, every node in P_0 is not visible in N, shown in (c). This contradicts that P_0 contains the network root $\rho(N)$ and $\rho(N)$ is visible with respect to each leaf in N. □

Theorem 6.4 *Let N be a stable-child network with n leaves. Then, $|\mathcal{R}(N)| \leq 7(n-1)$.*

Proof Let V denote the set of the $(n-1)$ internal nodes of degree 3 in T. Define

$$V_i = \{v \in V | w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2}) = i\}.$$

By Proposition 6.3 (b), $w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2}) \leq 10$. Hence, $V = \uplus_{i=0}^{10} V_i$, and thus $\sum_{i=0}^{10} |V_i| = n-1$.

Let $p(v)$ be the start node of the trivial path entering v in T. By Proposition 6.3 (c) and (d), if $v \in V_j$, then $p(v) \in V_0 \cup V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3 \cup V_4$ for each $j \in \{8, 9, 10\}$. By Proposition 6.3 (c), under the mapping $p(\cdot)$, at most two nodes in $V_8 \cup V_9 \cup V_{10}$ are mapped to the same node in V_0, and only one node can be mapped to $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3 \cup V_4$. Thus,

$$|V_8| + 2|V_9| + 3|V_{10}| \leq 3(|V_8| + |V_9| + |V_{10}|) \leq 6|V_0| + 3(\sum_{i=1}^{4} |V_i|).$$

Since $w(P_0) = 0$, the above inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{R}(N)| &= \sum_{v \in V} [w(P_{v1}) + w(P_{v2})] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{10} i|V_i| \\
&\leq |V_1| + 2|V_2| + 3|V_3| + 4|V_4| + 7\sum_{i=5}^{10} |V_i| + |V_8| + 2|V_9| + 3|V_{10}|) \\
&\leq |V_1| + 2|V_2| + 3|V_3| + 4|V_4| + 7\sum_{i=5}^{10} |V_i| + 6|V_0| + 3\sum_{i=1}^{4} |V_i| \\
&= 6|V_0| + 4|V_1| + 5|V_2| + 6|V_3| + 7|V_4| + 7\sum_{i=5}^{10} |V_i| \\
&\leq 7\sum_{i=0}^{10} |V_i| \\
&= 7(n-1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

7 Conclusion

We have established the tight upper bounds for the sizes of galled, nearly-stable, and stable-child networks. Since the number of internal tree nodes is equal to the number of leaves plus the number of reticulation nodes in a binary network, we can summarize our results in Table 1. Without question, these tight bounds provide insight to the study of combinatorial and algorithmic aspects of the network classes defined by visibility property.

Table 1 The tight upper bounds on the sizes of binary networks with n leaves defined by visibility property. The bound for reticulation visible network is found in Bordewich and Semple(2015).

	No. of reticulation nodes	No. of internal tree nodes
Galled Network	$2(n-1)$	$3(n-1)$
Reticulation visible network	$3(n-1)$	$4(n-1)$
Nearly-stable network	$3(n-1)$	$4(n-1)$
Stable-child network	$7(n-1)$	$8(n-1)$

References

1. Bordewich M, Semple C (2015) Reticulation-visible networks, arXiv:1508.05424v1.
2. Doolittle WF, Bapteste E (2007) Pattern pluralism and the tree of life hypothesis. Proc. the Nat'l Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 104: 2043–2049.
3. Fontaine MC et al. (2015) Extensive introgression in a malaria vector species complex revealed by phylogenomics, Science 347, 1258524. DOI: 10.1126/science.1258524
4. Francis AR, Steel M (2015) Which phylogenetic networks are merely trees with additional arcs? Syst. Biol., in press.
5. Gambette P, Gunawan ADM, Labarre A, Vialette S, Zhang L (2015) Locating a tree in a phylogenetic network in quadratic time, In Proc. of the 19th Int'l Conf. Res. in Comput. Mol. Biol. (RECOMB), pp. 96–107, Warsaw, Poland.
6. Gusfeld D (2014) ReCombinatorics: The algorithmics of ancestral recombination graphs and explicit phylogenetic networks. The MIT Press, Boston, USA.
7. Gusfield D, Eddhu S, Langley C (2004) Optimal, efficient reconstruction of phylogenetic networks with constrained recombination. J. Bioinfor. Comput. Biol. 2: 173-213.
8. Huson DH, Kloepper TH (2007) Beyond galled trees - decomposition and computation of galled networks. Proc. of the 19th Int'l Conf. Res. in Comput. Mol. Biol. (RECOMB), pp. 211–225.
9. Huson DH, Rupp R, Scornavacca C (2011) Phylogenetic network: concepts, algorithms, and applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
10. Marcussen T et al. (2014) Ancient hybridizations among the ancestral genomes of bread wheat. Science, doi: 10.1126/science.1250092
11. McBreen K, Lockhart PJ (2006) Reconstructing reticulate evolutionary histories of plants. Trends Plant Sci. 11: 103–122.
12. Treangen TJ, Rocha EPC (2011) Horizontal transfer, not duplication, drives the expansion of protein families in prokaryotes. PLoS Genet. e1001284. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001284.
13. Wang L, Zhang K, Zhang L (2001) Perfect phylogenetic networks with recombination. J. Comp. Biol. 8: 69–78.
14. Willson SJ (2010) Properties of normal phylogenetic networks, Bullet. Math. Biol. 72: 340–358.